

REMARKS

Claims 8-14 are pending in the present application, with claims 1-7 and 15-48 withdrawn. With entry of this Amendment, Applicant hereby amends claim 8, cancels claims 11-14 and adds new claims 49-51. Reexamination and reconsideration are respectfully requested.

The present invention as set forth in claim 8 is directed to an optical recording method. The method provides a first strategy and a second strategy relating to the pulse width of a laser drive signal and the power of the laser beam for the same model of the optical disk, the same recording rate and the same linear velocity. The first strategy is designed to shorten the pulse width and increase the power, and the second strategy is designed to lengthen the pulse width and decrease the power. Applicant has amended claim 8 to make clear that these two strategies are used in different recording modes, *i.e.*, a normal recording mode and an alternative recording mode. The normal recording mode directs a reduction of jitters of the information recorded on the optical disk, such as the recording of computer data. The alternative recording mode directs a reduction of crosstalk of the information recorded on the optical disk, such as the recording of audio data. Specifically, claim 8 as amended recites:

providing a first strategy and a second strategy for the same model of the optical disk, the same recording rate and the same linear velocity, the first strategy being designed to shorten the pulse width of the laser drive signal and increase the power of the laser beam as compared to the second strategy, the second strategy being designed to lengthen the pulse width of the laser drive signal and decrease the power of the laser beam as compared to the first strategy, each strategy being such as to create signals of the same mark length (or pit length) as those that would have been created by the other strategy; and

using changeably both of the first strategy and the second strategy dependently on conditions of the recording of information,

wherein the step of using changes the first strategy and the second strategy in accordance with a changeover operation of recording modes by a user, the recording modes representing the conditions of the recording of information, and

wherein the recording modes include a normal recording mode directing a reduction of jitters of the information recorded on the optical disk and an alternative recording mode directing a reduction of crosstalk of the information recorded on the optical disk, and wherein the step of using uses the first strategy for the normal recording mode and uses the second strategy for the alternative recording mode.

Claims 11 and 12 have accordingly been canceled.

In contrast, Nakajo fails to disclose using the first strategy for the normal recording mode and the second strategy for the alternative recording mode as specified by amended claim 8. Nakajo is directed to preventing deterioration of quality in the recording signal as the recording speed varies. (*See, e.g.*, Col. 1, lines 9-12.) For varying recording speed multiplying factors, it proposes setting the “modulation” (*see* Col. 3, lines 56-59 for its definition) and laser power to avoid jitter and cross-talk. For example, at Col. 5, lines 63-67, it states that “[b]y variably controlling the manner of modulation and laser power in accordance with the recording speed multiplying factor, a pit of a desired pit length can be formed while preventing effectively occurrence of crosstalk and jitter.” However, there is no disclosure of using the recited strategies in accordance with a normal recording mode and alternative recording mode as recited in the claims.

It appears from the Office Action that the Examiner considers different “recording modes” to be met by different recording speeds. However, claim 8 makes clear that the two strategies are provided for the same recording rate. Specifically, claim 8 recites “providing a first strategy and a second strategy for the same model of the optical disk, *the same recording rate* and the same linear velocity” That is, for a given recording rate, claim 8 provides different strategies for a normal recording mode and an alternative recording mode. Nakajo may provide different modulations and laser powers for different recording rates but, for a given recording rate, it does not provide the recited strategies for the recording modes as claimed. Accordingly, claim 8 is not anticipated by Nakajo.

Claims 9 and 10, which depend from claim 8, are not anticipated by Nakajo for at least the reasons set forth for claim 8.

Applicant has added a new independent claim 49 identical to amended claim 8, and further defining the normal recording mode as “directed to recording of information representing computer data” and the alternative recording mode as “directed to recording of information representing audio data.” This recitation is similar to claim 13 (now canceled). Applicant respectfully submits that Nakajo fails to disclose this recitation for the reasons set forth above and, furthermore, for the

reason that Nakajo does not disclose using the recited two strategies according to a normal recording mode for computer data and an alternative recording mode for audio data. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 49 and its dependent claims 50 and 51 are in condition for allowance.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. If it is determined that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

In the unlikely event that the transmittal letter is separated from this document and the Patent Office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, Applicant petitions for any required relief including extensions of time and authorizes the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to **Deposit Account No. 03-1952** referencing Docket No. 393032043800.

Dated: March 23, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By /MehranArjomand/
Mehran Arjomand
Registration No.: 48,231
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
555 West Fifth Street
Los Angeles, California 90013-1024
(213) 892-5630